



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/728,938	12/08/2003	Sachiko Nemoto	5243-002-US01	8989
79184	7590	08/25/2010	EXAMINER	
HANIFY & KING PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW Suite 400 WASHINGTON, DC 20007			RIVAS, SALVADOR E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2477	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/25/2010	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/728,938	NEMOTO ET AL.	

  

<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
SALVADOR E. RIVAS	2477	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(1) SALVADOR E. RIVAS. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) MICHAEL SCHWARTZ (REG. No. 40,161). (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 20 August 2010

**Time:** 11:30 AM

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

5

Prior art documents discussed:

Kong et al. (US-PGPUB # 2002/0176450 A1)

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Chirag G Shah/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2477

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner and Mr.Michael Schwartz discussed claim 5 of application #10/728,938. The examiner proposed to Mr.Schwartz to cancelling claim 5 based on new prior art (Kong et al. ref) found. The examiner explained to Mr.Schwartz how the new prior art overcame the applicant arguments (see page 6 last line and page 7 lines 1-3 of applicant's remarks). No agreement was reached with regards to claim 5. Mr.Schwartz recommended to the examiner to issue a new action with regards to claim 5 and the new prior art presented in order for applicant to review and respond to the new prior art.